

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated January 20, 2004. Claims 1 to 8, 10 to 17, 19, 20, 22, 25, 26, 31 and 32 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 5, 6, 8 and 10 to 17 have been amended. Claims 1 and 10 are the independent claims herein. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

As a formal matter, Applicants note an error in the flow of Figure 8 which differs from the description of that figure as provided in the specification at page 14, lines 16 to 18. As such, a Replacement Sheet for Figure 8 is being provided herewith in which the flow from step S810 back to step S805 has been changed to reflect a flow from step S810 back to step S805. The Examiner's approval of the drawing change is hereby respectfully solicited.

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the indication that Claims 8, 15 and 17 would be allowable if they are rewritten into independent form. In this regard, Applicants note that the subject matter of Claim 6 is substantially the same as Claim 15, but Claim 6 has been omitted from the list of allowable claims. Accordingly, Applicants request confirmation that Claim 6, like Claim 15, would be allowable if rewritten into independent form. Nonetheless, Applicants have chosen not to rewrite the claims at this time since it is believed that the base claims for each of these claims are allowable for at least the reasons set forth below.

Claims 1 to 7, 10 to 14, 16, 19, 20, 22, 25, 26, 31 and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,956,487 (Venkatraman). The rejections

are respectfully traversed and the Examiner is requested to reconsideration and withdraw the rejection in light of the following comments.

In the present invention, a user accesses a printer's web page from an embedded web server of the printer. The user then enters a URL that may either 1) correspond to a document to be printed, or 2) correspond to a remote website that is to be browsed for a document to be printed. In either case, the document to be printed is retrieved by the printer and the printer automatically prints out the retrieved document. Thus, print-by-reference functionality is provided for the printer to pull-print documents from the Internet and then to automatically print them.

Referring specifically to the claims, amended independent Claim 1 is a control method for controlling a printer for providing print-by-reference functionality to a web browser, the method comprising the steps of providing a web page from a printer's embedded web server to the web browser, receiving a URL entered into the provided web page by the web browser, the printer retrieving a document to be printed corresponding to the URL from a web site on the Internet, and the printer automatically printing the retrieved document.

Amended independent Claim 10 is a computer-executable process steps claim that substantially corresponds to Claim 1.

The applied art is not seen to disclose or to suggest the features of Claims 1 and 10, and in particular, is not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the feature of

Venkatraman is seen to disclose that a user accesses a web page of a printer from the printer's embedded web server. The received web page includes general information about the printer, as well as hyperlinks for the user to obtain further

information. For instance, the web page may include links to manuals, parts lists, and other associated publications relevant to the printer. (See column 7, lines 15 to 22.) Thus, while Venkatraman may allow a user to access a printer's web page from an embedded web server, and to select a hyperlink corresponding to a stored user's manual, parts list or other publication, any similarity between Venkatraman and the present invention ends there.

In Venkatraman, once the user selects the hyperlink for the user's manual, parts list or other publication, the publication is presumably either provided to the user's web browser for them to view it electronically, or is downloaded to the user's computer so they can view it in an application program, such as Adobe PDF, Microsoft Word, etc. If the user wants to then print the publication, they need to select a printing operation in their web browser or application program to have the publication processed by a print driver and submitted to the printer to be printed out. The foregoing is presumptive based on common knowledge since Venkatraman is silent as to whether anything different happens when a user selects the hyperlink corresponding to the publication. Thus, even if the printer of Venkatraman could retrieve the publication when the user selects the hyperlink, it (the printer) does not then automatically print the retrieved publication. Accordingly, the present invention is believed to be patentably distinct from Venkatraman.

In view of the foregoing deficiencies of the applied art, amended independent Claims 1 and 10, as well as the claims dependent therefrom, are believed to be allowable.

No other matters having been raised, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicants

Registration No. 42,746

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-2200
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 78809v1